

D R A F T

Meeting Minutes, 5/19/05

Committee for Citizen Involvement

CCI Members Present: Robert Cancelosi, Basil Christopher, Bev Froude, Brian Kelly, Stacie Yost

CCI Members Absent: Sue Carver, Teddi Duling, Trisha Swanson, Bill Scheiderich

Staff Present: Liz Newton, Duane Roberts

Guests: Martha Bishop, Jason Rogers

1. Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 7:07 PM by Duane Roberts. He announced that CD Director Jim Hendryx would not be attending the meeting and also that four CCI members had contacted staff to indicate that they would be absent. He stated that staff anticipates the CCI very soon will elect a chair. This has been delayed because of the recent addition of 5-6 new members.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on March 17th, were approved by the committee as submitted.

3. Pilot Neighborhood Areas Boundary Refinement

Liz reviewed proposed refinements to the previously-presented neighborhood boundaries map. These adjustments are based on comments provided by residents within the affected areas. The biggest areas contain non-residential land uses. In these areas residents and businesses will be encouraged to work together. The goal is to split the City into 12-14 areas. Three of these will be picked to take part in a pilot program. She anticipates further boundary adjustments in mid-June when a newly-hired GIS (Geographic Information System) specialist starts work with the City. The new GIS staff will be asked to run Neighborhood Area population counts. The school attendance area boundaries were useful starting points for defining areas because they are population-based. Areas where "we know people are already involved" as volunteers and would be easy to mobilize will be an important factor in picking the pilot areas.

Basil talked about the purposes the neighborhood program might serve. He recommended that these be put on a written list. He also asked about the authority the neighborhood groups might have, commenting that many people

are indifferent about public involvement because they feel their input “doesn’t matter”. Liz responded that a mission statement for the Neighborhood Program was needed and would address the program’s purpose. One idea for giving the neighborhoods a “say” in City operations is to give the neighborhood land use representative the right to speak before the Planning Commission and Council on any land use topic or neighborhood issue. The idea is to “allow neighborhoods to provide input on what they are experts on in their neighborhood.” Another idea is to get the neighborhoods more involved in the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) process by allowing them to weigh in on “their neighborhood [CIP-related] issue.”

As an example of poor city communications with its citizens, Robert brought up the case of a City-initiated slope stabilization project that took place in the Quail Hollow neighborhood this week. This was a fairly big project with a lot of trucks and equipment coming into the neighborhood. The neighbors were confused and upset because they hadn't received any notice about the project or its timing. This led to a lengthy CCI discussion of the City's public notice policy regarding CIP projects in general. In the case of land use approvals, the public notice policy is defined by ordinance and is very clear cut. The same doesn't seem to be true of City-sponsored CIP projects that don't involve a land use permit. The committee asked staff to investigate and report back at their next meeting on the City's CIP public notice policies and practices.

Liz commented that this illustrates the point of the Neighborhood Program, which is to make neighborhoods aware of what is happening in the neighborhood. Building relationships between the neighborhood and the City will help the City to defuse potential controversies. Beverly commented that the City “needs to make a list of things that require public notice.” She favors an on-site project sign requirement for public improvement projects. The sign should include information on the work scope, dates, and contact person for the project. She suggested a color coding system for the signs based on the type of project. Web site posting also should be considered.

Liz commented that it is important to keep neighborhood/City lines of communication open. If we want to build community and get people more involved, people need to be informed of CIP activities that affect the neighborhood. The CCI’s purview includes making recommendations to Council regarding citizen communications that work. Several CCI members spoke in support of bringing the project notice problem to Council’s attention. The CCI asked staff to investigate current public notice policies and practices and to report back to the committee at its next meeting.

Jason Rogers, President of the Summer Lake Neighborhood Association, arrived at this point in the meeting. Liz earlier mentioned that she had invited him to attend. Liz asked him to view and comment on the boundaries of the proposed Neighborhood Area that includes his association. In general, he concurs with the boundaries as drawn. He commented that the Summer Lake Association focuses on quality of life issues at the neighborhood level. “We bring people

together when we need to deal with irritants to the neighborhood.” Some association members “really get emotionally charged” if problems are allowed to go on for too long. Noxious vegetation is an example. The association reminds owners of the need to keep up their properties. The association’s covenants and restrictions provide needed enforcement authority.

4. CCI/Council Joint Meeting Debriefing

Three CCI members participated in the joint meeting: Stacie, Basil, and Teddi. Stacie commented that the joint meeting with Council was a great opportunity, if the committee had had something important to bring to their attention. Basil commented that he had not been aware beforehand that the CCI members would be asked to sit at the table with Council and would be asked questions by them. He felt somewhat “put on the spot” by the way the joint meeting was conducted.

The joint meeting debriefing led to a discussion of the CCI’s meeting schedule. Stacie, Robert, and Bev spoke in support of a transition to monthly CCI meetings. Staff was asked to poll the membership on the question of monthly versus bi-month meetings. *[Note: This poll was conducted as requested. The poll results support a transition to monthly meetings, with no member expressing opposition to such a change.]*

Stacie mentioned that she would like to attend some of the pilot neighborhood meetings “to observe the process.” She asked if this would be allowed. Staff commented that he assumed so and would check with Liz regarding a meeting and location schedule. *[Note: Liz was contacted and confirmed that CCI member attendance would pose “no problem” and that, when developed, she would provide a pilot program meeting schedule to the CCI.]*

Robert asked about the City’s policy regarding Tigard committee members attending unincorporated area CPO meetings. He referred to a new City rule of some kind he had heard about that addresses this. Beverly commented that there is a new rule, and it is that a City staff or committee member cannot be sent as a City representative to any CPO or other unincorporated area meeting without that person being accompanied by a County counterpart. At the committee’s request, staff promised to check into and report back regarding the new policy. *[Note: According to Jim Hendryx, the new, Council-approved procedure is that when an NPO wishes to invite a City staff member to participate in a meeting, the NPO is required to first contact the County to request a County representative to attend the meeting. When invited, City staff will attend an unincorporated area meeting only when a County representative is committed to attend. City and County attendees should be matched by level of responsibility. In general, the same applies to a City committee representative who is asked by a CPO to attend a meeting on behalf of his/her committee. Draft procedures are in preparation.]*

5. Develop CCI Mission Statement

Stacie asked if the CCI's role was to provide feedback to citizens or to Council. Duane commented that the resolution re-establishing the CCI talks about the CCI as providing advice to Council on behalf of the citizens. Bev commented that it (the CCI) is "another way for Council to hear what people have to say." Stacie commented that the most effective approach to developing a mission statement would be for someone to write comments on a big board so everyone can see the wording being proposed. This would enable the CCI to wordsmith the MS as a group.

This item was continued to the next meeting.

6. Land Use Neighborhood Meeting Process

Duane introduced this item. He overviewed the contents of the Neighborhood Meeting Packet that the City provides to developers. He mentioned that the pre-application Neighborhood Meeting requirement was adopted in 1999. Its purpose is to inform the neighborhood of a proposed development and to provide an informal opportunity to raise concerns about a project. Bev commented that she had participated in several of these meetings and is critical of their usefulness. Developers don't send informed representatives to the meetings and developers often modify the design of projects they submit for City approval. In her words: "It's a fraud". Robert commented that the developer's plans change over time as a project is being put together. No deception necessarily is involved.

Bev commented that the neighborhood meeting packet should include a "big green sheet" explaining the next steps in the application process. Robert commented that the "small guy", for example, a homebuilder developing a few in-fill projects each year, is already overburdened by the existing notice and other municipal land use requirements.

Basil called attention to the notice area. He commented that the mandatory 500-foot notice radius is too small. The bigger the project the bigger should be the notice area. Signs should be prominently posted on the site. Bev commented that "there is never anyone in charge at the meetings." Stacie suggested the use of a "neutral facilitator to direct the meeting." The rationale is that this may help to defuse any anger.

Basil asked what part of the packet goes to residents. *[Note: the two 1-page sheets, "Neighborhood Meeting Information Sheet" and "Questions to Ask . . ." are included in the mailing along with the "Notice of Neighborhood Meeting" and site map.]* He commented that Friday is not a suitable night for the neighborhood meeting. Others agreed that Friday is not an appropriate meeting night.

This item was continued to the next meeting.

[Note: Dick Bewersdorff, Planning Division Manager, provided the following comments. The residents can always talk to the planner involved in reviewing a project if they have any questions, and many do. Often, the developer has not made up his/her mind regarding the type of land use process to pursue. In the case of a subdivision, a regular subdivision or a planned development are available permit options. When the application is submitted, notice regarding the application type and process are mailed to residents within a 500' radius. This exceeds the legally required 250' notice radius and the 300' radius that most area jurisdictions follow. Comparatively speaking, Tigard does not have any "big developments," as such. The scales of local projects are relatively small. The neighborhood meeting is not meant to be a perfect process. Its primary purpose is to keep residents informed, to have input, and to be listened to by the developer. The number of questions and the number of appeals has decreased as a result of the meetings. The Development Code determines the requirements that have to be met and the land use rules that apply. There are rules regarding tree removal, the number of lots allowed, storm drainage, and so on. A particular concern of Bull Mountain's residents is the 5,000 square foot lot size zoning, but that follows the density adopted by the Washington County Plan. Dick agrees that Friday evening is not a suitable meeting time. He will look into changing the meeting guidelines to eliminate Friday as an available meeting night.]

The meeting ended at 8:45 PM.

Next Meeting: Thursday, June 16, 2005 Tigard City Hall, Red Rock Conference Room.

Tentative agenda items:

- Neighborhood Program update
- Land use proposal, "Neighborhood Meeting Process" (continued from May meeting)
- City CIP notification policies and practices
- CCI mission statement (continued from May meeting)
- Proposed change in CCI meeting day of the month
- CCI chair and vice-chair selection process
- Other business and announcements